

**Review of Progress Implementation Report for
NIOSH Traumatic Injury Program**

Submitted by Board of Scientific Counselors

November 30, 2012

BSC Working Group Members

**Kitty Gelberg
Cori Peek-Asa
Jim Platner**

Traumatic Injury Score Sheet

Directions: For each recommendation listed below, please circle a score for each scoring element and provide a brief justification for the assignment of that score. The work group may provide scores in .5 increments where they deem appropriate. If the group chooses to do that, please put a .5 next to the corresponding number and circle that number.

Recommendations In Progress:

Recommendation #1

Continue setting goals that are within the TI Research Program's scope and resources.

Relevance: 1 2 3 4 5 – **SCORE: 4**

Brief Justification:

The majority of the focus was on motor vehicles. Little information was presented on other topics. Joint efforts with other agencies, for example, were not really highlighted as part of the strategic plan.

Guiding activities through an iterative strategic planning process is an effective way to respond to the recommendation. It was not clear in the description what process was used to develop and modify the plan (other than that different teams work on different goals). For example, is there a specific process to identify gaps in the program and tie these responses to existing resources? It might be helpful to use methods such as SWOT analyses (which may be used but the process was not described). The criteria listed for goal identification are relevant and appropriate.

Sustainability: 1 2 3 4 5 – **SCORE: 4**

Brief Justification:

The approach described is participatory and ongoing. Based on the recommendation, surveillance data have been integrated as key criteria.

Competing priorities and the potential for incomplete products within the life of the plan is of concern. The reviewers also recognize that other agencies and agency leaders may develop priorities that are not integrated with this plan, and to which the team will need to respond.

Since much of the data needed for the prioritization process is external, ongoing planning that integrates these data will necessitate continued interaction with these agencies. However, changes to these protocols are beyond the scope of this team.

The reviewers noted that three-year review of goals may be too frequent, especially as some of these goals are long-term and the review process is very time- and labor-intensive. We recommend a five year review and update of these goals and this plan.

Progress: 1 2 3 4 5 – **SCORE: 5**

Brief Justification:

The plan has been implemented and maintained with clear goals to continue making progress in the future. Some high-impact achievements were noted, but what these activities were based on or how they were integrated with the strategic plan was not noted. Linking individual projects and activities should be linked to the goals and subgoals of the plan to help with benchmarking and seeing where successes and gaps exist.

Potential Impact: 1 2 3 4 5 – **SCORE: 4**

Brief Justification:

There was no mention of how progress and impact from the strategic plan is evaluated. Although some intermediate outcomes were mentioned, the process for developing and measuring tactics, incremental objectives/strategies, or the use of benchmarks or an underlying logic model was not clarified. How inter- and intra-agency collaborations integrate into the plan should be described, especially with respect to impact and how team work can influence the work of others. Emphasizing outreach to stakeholders and soliciting their feedback is an important component of strategic planning. Although this is part of the plan, new strategies for seeking this input might be warranted.

Recommendation #2

Develop an explicit plan for each subgoal.

Relevance: 1 2 3 4 5 – **SCORE: 4.5**

Brief Justification:

Overall, the TI has adopted an organized and effective approach. There is good integration with sector goals, but not necessarily with the strategic plan. It would be beneficial to see some objectives within the subgoals that focus on collaboration and infrastructure, as the singular focus on stage of research allows the plan to move forward project-by-project rather than in a manner that moves the entire field forward. It would be useful if the research was being turned to practice by more people.

Sustainability: 1 2 3 4 5 – **SCORE: 5**

Brief Justification:

Some of the subgoals are beyond the control of the team – such as industry implementing slip, trip, and fall programs. The team can take substantive steps to encourage this implementation, and perhaps these activities are a more appropriate sub-goal than the actual implementation in individual companies.

Progress: 1 2 3 4 5 – **SCORE: 3.5**

Brief Justification:

The process of evaluating success is not clear. It is recommended that with each written objective or goal have a specific benchmark to determine if the goal has been met, if adequate

progress has been made, and if follow-up goals are appropriate. In general, we did not feel this could be assessed yet.

Potential Impact: 1 2 3 4 5 – **SCORE: 4**

Brief Justification: See comments above. The activities described have impact on the larger field, but how this will be measured within the framework of the strategic plan is not clear.

Recommendation #3

Work with other federal agencies that support injury prevention and control research.

Relevance: 1 2 3 4 5 – **SCORE: 5**

Brief Justification:

This is a very important goal and the TI has responded well. Organizing interagency partnerships around rule-making and research is a smart approach and likely to work well. Interagency partnerships are very time-consuming and can take a long time to develop, although the team has some very nice examples of successes. Because data collection is so expensive, these collaborations definitely provide the opportunity to get more out than put in.

Sustainability: 1 2 3 4 5 – **SCORE: 3.5**

Brief Justification:

With the breadth of topics covered by the TI, maintaining partnerships with all of the relevant agencies is resource-intensive. The regular meetings and taskforce approach described is important, as without regular contact communication is likely to be lost. A plan to help identify and organize NIOSH personnel on these activities might be warranted, as the number of partnerships and opportunities for communication are vast.

Increasing limitations on data sharing could be a concern for sustainability.

Progress: 1 2 3 4 5 – **SCORE: 5**

Brief Justification:

Having said, above, that the number of partnerships is daunting, it is still recommended that stronger ties be made with motor vehicle safety agencies, especially since motor vehicle safety is a key priority and focus in the strategic plan. In addition to ongoing partnerships with NCIPC and NHTSA, FHSA is also an important partner because of their activities focused on the built environment and the Coast Guard because of their work with the fishing community.

Potential Impact: 1 2 3 4 5 – **SCORE: 5**

Brief Justification:

NIOSH is uniquely suited to develop these partnerships and is doing a good job leading this effort. These partnerships are likely to be beneficial to NIOSH for sustainability, and also likely to have strong impact on the intramural and extramural research infrastructure. NIOSH is encouraged to document and share these efforts and successes, which will be important to demonstrate the significant value of NIOSH. There are some severe issues on data sharing from other agencies that need to be addressed through the Director's office, since these issues are larger than just the TI program.

Recommendation #6

Ensure collaboration among NIOSH-funded researchers.

Relevance: 1 2 3 4 5 – **SCORE: 4**

Brief Justification:

Activities to foster collaboration are essential to maximize use of resources, but are also time-consuming and must be strategic to be successful. There is no discussion as to how these projects were prioritized other than that they address others' goals. Awareness between extra- and intramural programs is not sufficient, and a plan with clear goals to integrate activities would be helpful. The program does not appear to be actively seeking input from sectors and incorporating them into the plan. Extramural partners do not appear to be informed of intramural activities. NIOSH could encourage warehousing NIOSH-funded databases, data collection tools, surveys, etc. Conferences such as NOIRS are very helpful in bringing researchers together and should be continued.

Sustainability: 1 2 3 4 5 – **SCORE: 4**

Brief Justification:

It would be helpful to know who is reaching back to the TI program. It is difficult to maintain the level of communication, if it is not being sought from outside partners. It is important to consider which partnerships will yield the highest impact, such as the Safe States Alliance, SAVIR, and ASTHO. It is recommended that the most promising partners and activities be prioritized, so focus will remain on those that will become sustainable. Efforts to work with individual state health offices are likely to be resource-intensive and spotty to be beneficial in the long-term (other than specific project collaborations). This activity is even more difficult due to travel restrictions.

Progress: 1 2 3 4 5 – **SCORE: 5**

Brief Justification:

Some strong thinking has clearly gone into this step, with some good progress in outreach from the intramural to the extramural program. Some very good examples of NIOSH-led collaborative activities are described, including conferences, special issues of publications, and steps to increase communication.

Potential Impact: 1 2 3 4 5 – **SCORE: 4**

Brief Justification:

It appears the TI program has been successful in doing their part; however, the approach is not well-defined or sufficiently targeted to best leverage available resources. For example, providing information to internal researchers about external research, without specific plans of what the internal researchers are supposed to do with that information and how it will be evaluated, are not likely to yield systematic or sustainable impacts. It is recommended that the program evaluate the interest of other parties when they prioritize their goals and partners.

Recommendation #9

Research prevention strategies for traumatic injuries in a changing workplace.

Relevance: 1 2 3 4 5 – **SCORE: 5**

Brief Justification:

This is a very broad goal that imposes a new priority on the strategic process for the TI activities. The team has done a good job focusing on this issue and has made some good progress on outcomes. The efforts to integrate work changes into surveillance efforts is impressive. The TI team has also been effective in integrating this topic into the existing priority areas.

Sustainability: 1 2 3 4 5 – **SCORE: 4**

Brief Justification:

This is a topic that will continue to be important in the future. It is difficult to identify emerging issues; it takes time and vigilance and will require significant resources. Workforce issues will require specific funding. Perhaps more appropriate is integrating this goal as a sub-component of the existing goals identified through the TI strategic planning process rather than maintaining this as a separate goal. A blend of approaches may be best, but regardless the process needs to be well documented through measurable objectives. New technologies, such as autonomous vehicles, are missing from this work.

Progress: 1 2 3 4 5 – **SCORE: 4**

Brief Justification:

Good progress has been made on this goal, including some success stories. The evaluations have been strong.

Potential Impact: 1 2 3 4 5 – **SCORE: 5**

Brief Justification:

This probably has the greatest potential for impact. This is in progress, so it is suspected that this will improve as more research is being conducted, and the results will then be utilized. It is important to define how this topic fits within the strategic plan.

